REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Office Action mailed August 17, 2007 ("Office Action"). With this response, Applicants amend claims 1 and 12, cancel claims 3 and 14 without prejudice or disclaimer, and add new claims 29-35. Each of new claims 29-35 is supported by the specification and/or drawings as originally filed and therefore no new matter has been added. After entry of this response, claims 1, 4-5, 7-12, 15-17, 19-25, and 28-35 will be pending.

In addition, Applicants do not necessarily agree with or acquiesce to the Examiner's characterization of the claims or the prior art, even if those characterizations are not addressed herein.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102[1]

Claims 1 and 12

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0086481 ("Sih"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended claim 1 recites "generating a plurality of interrupts in a transfer of symbols between fingers of a rake receiver and a processor, wherein the interrupts are produced by the fingers of the rake receiver at a rate of generation per unit time independent of a time rate of the symbol boundaries." (emphasis added). To establish

---

[1] Applicants note that on page 2 the Examiner listed claim 26 as rejected. However, Applicants had cancelled claim 26 in the Amendment After Final filed August 6, 2007.

a proper 102 rejection under MPEP § 2131, each element of the claim must be disclosed expressly or inherently within the prior art. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants respectfully submit that Sih fails to disclose each and every element of amended claim 1.

Sih discloses a CDMA demodulator that "can be scaled efficiently to include additional fingers in a hardware efficient manner" by "decoupling of the chip rate processing from chip time, which allows a single offline processing unit to service a plurality of fingers." (Sih, [0008]). Sih's demodulator includes an offline processing unit 410, a finger timing unit 420, which includes finger counters 510A-510N, and interrupt controller 520. (Sih, [0035]). To process symbols, Sih discloses that the offline processing unit 410 schedules symbol processing for each finger using finger counters 510A-510N, respectively. (Sih, [0041]). In order to access the offline processing unit 410 "[e]ach finger counter 510A-510N issues a request to the offline processing unit 410 on a processing cycle boundary, which corresponds to a boundary of 1 or more symbols." (Sih, [0043]). For example, Sih discloses that in cases where symbols for normal traffic are 64 chips, "processing requests can be made by each finger counter 510A-510N every 64 chips by detecting when the bit 9 of the counter toggles." Id. Similarly, Sih discloses that in cases where the symbols for normal traffic are 128 chips, "the processing cycle boundary can be detected when bit 10 of a counter toggles, or

when the 10 LSBs are equal to 0." *Id.* In other words, Sih discloses that interrupts are generated from each finger counter at a fixed rate based on the symbol boundary. Sih further discloses, that in cases where different counters simultaneously issue processing requests, "the interrupt controller 520 is deployed to intercept the various requests [interrupts] from the finger counters 510A-510N and arbitrate between them." (emphasis added) *Id.* In this situation, the interrupt controller 520 issues a processing request, or interrupt, distinct from the interrupts generated by the finger counters, to the offline processing unit 410. *Id.* In other words, the interrupt controller 520 issues interrupts at a rate independent of the time rate of symbol boundaries when more than one finger issues an interrupt to the offline processing unit simultaneously.

However, amended claim 1 teaches that the interrupts "are produced by the fingers of the rake receiver at a rate of generation per unit time independent of a time rate of the symbol boundaries. Sih, in contrast, teaches that interrupts are generated by the fingers "on a processing cycle boundary, which corresponds to a boundary of 1 or more symbols." (emphasis added). *Id.* Sih discloses that interrupt controller 520 generates interrupts, distinct from the interrupts generated by the finger counters, at a rate independent of the time rate of symbol boundaries. Sih, however, fails to disclose or teach that the finger counters, themselves, generate interrupts at a rate independent of the time rate of symbol boundaries.

Therefore, Sih fails to disclose or suggest "generating a plurality of interrupts in a transfer of symbols between fingers of a rake receiver and a processor, wherein the interrupts are produced by the fingers of the rake receiver at a rate of generation per

unit time independent of a time rate of the symbol boundaries." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over Sih.

Claims 3-5, and 7 depend on claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 12 recites "a plurality of fingers for processing the plurality of multi-path signals, wherein the fingers produce a plurality of interrupts based on a transfer of symbols from the rake receiver to the processor at a rate of generation per unit time independent of the time rate of the symbol boundaries." As stated above, Sih fails to disclose or suggest "the fingers produce a plurality of interrupts based on a transfer of symbols from the rake receiver to the processor at a rate of generation per unit time independent of the time rate of the symbol boundaries." For at lease these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Claims 14-17 depend on claim 12 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 12.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that at least claims 8-11 and 19-25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. (Office Action, page 4, lines 9-11). Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter. In the interest of expediting prosecution of the present application and without conceding the issue of patentability with respect to the rejected

base claims, claims 8-11 and 19-25 have been rewritten as new claims 29-35 as

suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 29-35 are

immediately allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully

requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance

of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge

any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: _____11/ 1/0_____   By: _____
                                      Linda J. Thayer
                                      Reg. No. 45,681